

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Rider at the interview held September 25, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,873,107 ("Borovoy") in view of Max et al., "Reversing Controlled Document Authoring to Normalize Documents," in the proceeding of EACL '03 Student Research Workshop, Budapest, Hungary, 2003, pp. 33-40 ("Max"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**Claims 1 and 11**

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a method for stenographically processing input data, including receiving short note input data, using a semantic grammar to generate semantic structure, producing with a first realization grammar a plurality of local text realizations from the semantic structure, matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure, producing with a second realization grammar global text realizations from the final semantic structure, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 11.

The Patent Office alleges that Borovoy discloses receiving short note input data, producing with a first realization grammar a plurality of local text realizations from the semantic structures, matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure, and producing with a second realization

grammar global text realizations from the final semantic structure. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Borovoy discloses the ability to allow an author to continuously retrieve information potentially relevant to the text he/she is authoring. That is, the author enters text in one portion of a user interface, key words are then extracted from the text and used as query words for an information retrieval mechanism, and such information is displayed in a second portion of the user interface (see abstract).

In contrast, claims 1 and 11 require receiving short note input data, using a semantic grammar to generate semantic structure, producing with a first realization grammar a plurality of local text realizations from the semantic structure. That is, the short note input data is converted from short notes into complete grammatical texts, for example complete sentences. Nowhere does Borovoy teach or suggest taking text (i.e., short note text) entered by a user and thereafter converting the short notes into complete grammatical texts. Borovoy merely discloses taking key words from text and providing the author with information about each of the key words. Borovoy does not use existing authored documents to re-create or "author" texts as alleged by the Patent Office.

Further, the Patent Office concedes that Borovoy fails to disclose using semantic grammar and relies on Max as allegedly teaching this feature.

However, Max is not a proper prior art reference as the subject matter claimed in the present application was invented prior to April, 2003, the publication date of Max. To this end, enclosed herewith is a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 and a redacted Invention Proposal dated prior to April, 2003, demonstrating that the presently claimed subject matter was invented prior the invention disclosed in Max.

Claims 19, 21 and 22

For the reasons discussed above, Borovoy fails to disclose a computer program product recited in claims 19 and 21, and a system for converting short notes recited in claim 22. In addition, the Patent Office concedes that Borovoy fails to disclose using semantic grammar and relies on Max as allegedly teaching this feature. However, as discussed above, Max is not a proper prior art reference.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 11, 19, 21 and 22, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones  
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/hs

Attachment:

Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131

Date: October 16, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 24-0037